

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **6 July 2006**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-21. The specification of the disclosure was objected to because of informalities. Claims 8-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-6, 8-13, and 15-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Thatte et al (USPN 6,442,620, hereinafter "Thatte"). Claims 7, 14, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Thatte in view of Gibbons et al (USPN 5,761,511, hereinafter "Gibbons").

Objections to the disclosure

The specification of the disclosure was objected to because of informalities.

Applicant has amended the specification to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 8-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant has amended independent claim 8 to limit the computer-readable storage medium to tangible implementations. No new matter has been added. Applicant has canceled claims 15-21 without prejudice.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1 and 8 were rejected as being anticipated by Thatte. Applicant respectfully points out that Thatte teaches a **single API function** (factory) to create components (see Thatte, Col. 10, lines 38-44).

In contrast, the present invention creates **a unique factory** to build each component (see FIG. 2 and paragraphs [0025]-[0028] of the instant application). This is beneficial because, inter alia, the components created by the unique factories are reentrant. Note that prior art systems provide only a single implementation of each component; therefore the software system created from these components is not reentrant (see paragraph [0006] of the instant application). There is nothing within Thatte, either explicit or implicit, which suggests creating a unique factory to build each component..


Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 8 to clarify that the present invention creates **a unique factory** to build each component. These amendments find support in FIG. 2 and in paragraphs [0025]-[0028] of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 8 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-7, which depend upon claim 1, and claims 9-14, which depend upon claim 8, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 31 July 2006

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com